



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

*TS*

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/828,799

04/22/2004

Larry L. Russell

REED1001.11

5064

47953

7590

10/19/2006

LAW OFFICE OF KARRY W. WANG  
3342 PARK RIDGE DR  
RICHMOND, CA 94806

EXAMINER

CHANNAVAJALA, SRIRAMA T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2166

DATE MAILED: 10/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/828,799	<b>Applicant(s)</b> RUSSELL, LARRY L.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Srirama Channavajjala	<b>Art Unit</b> 2166	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 April 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 April 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

***DETAILED ACTION***

This Application is a DIVISIONAL of **09/746,260**.

1. Claims 1-8 are presented for examination.

***Drawings***

2. The Drawings filed on 04/22/2004 are acceptable for examination purpose, however, formal drawings are required in response to this office action.

***Priority***

3. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for domestic priority based on Parent Application No. 09/746,260 and provisional application No. 60/171,620, 60/181,047 filed on 12/23/1999, and 2/8/2000 respectively under 35 U.S.C. 119(e).

***Specification***

4. At page 1 "cross references" to related applications is hereby required to provide updating their status in response to this office action.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. At page 12, claim 5, line 3-4, the limitation "providing....**secured portion of the database**" is not defined in the specification, nor shown in fig 1-2, Upon reviewing the specification page 1-10, examiner found that there is no support for "**secured portion of the database**"

**The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:**

he specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claim 1,5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
8. As to claim 1, 5, the limitations "a location where the **user may** have received the television broadcast of the web site address;

a time of day or date or dates when the user may have received the television broadcast of the web site address;

a channel number or call-letters for the station on which the web site address may have been broadcast; and

the name of a television program the user may have been watching when the web site address may have been broadcast” are being indefinite because it is not clear what is meant by “user may”...., for compact prosecution, examiner assumes “user have been watching..... in the present office action.

9. As to claim 3, it is not clear what is meant by “a product or products” associated with the web site address; “a service or services associated with the web site address” and “a subject matter of interest” and is being indefinite because upon reviewing specification at page 5, line 25-28, page 6, page 7, line 1-10] merely suggests web site address and broadcasting without specifically defining what is “a product or products”, “a service or services” and “a subject matter of interest”, for compact prosecution, examiner assumes information provided or stored in the database particularly web sites broadcasting on a television related to program guide provides products, services and specific content or subject matter of interest in the office action.

10. As to claim 5, it is not clear what is meant by “**secured portion of the database**”, for compact prosecution, examiner assumes and treated as secured portion of the database corresponds to user-defined records with each record

Art Unit: 2166

corresponding to the a computer service i.e., records including identifier fields in the data structure/

Appropriate correction required.

No new matter should be entered

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

***11. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because invention is directed to nonstatutory subject matter.***

#### ***As set forth in MPEP 2106(11)A:***

*Identify and understand Any Practical Application Asserted for the Invention The claimed invention as a whole must accomplish a practical application. That is, it must produce a "useful, concrete and tangible result." State Street, 149 F 3d at 1373, 47USPQ2d at 1601-02. The purpose of this requirement is to limit patent protection to inventions that possess a certain level of "real world" value, as opposed to subject matter that represents nothing more than an idea or concept, or is simply a starting point for future investigation or research (Brenner v. Manson, 383 U. S. 519, 528-36, 148 USPQ 689, 693-96); In re Ziegler, 992, F 2d 1197, 1200-03, 26 USPQ2d 1600, 1603-06 (Fed. Cir. 1993)). Accordingly, a complete disclosure should contain some*

indication of the **practical application** for the claimed invention, i.e., why the applicant believes the claimed invention is useful.

Apart from the utility requirement of 35 USC. 101, usefulness under the patent eligibility standard requires significant functionality to be present to satisfy the useful result aspect of the practical application requirement. See *Arrhythmia*, 958 F 2d at 1057, 22 USPQ2d at 1036. Merely claiming nonfunctional descriptive material stored in a computer-readable medium does not make the invention eligible for patenting. For example, a claim directed to a word processing file stored on a disk may satisfy the utility requirement of 35 U.S. C. 101 since the information stored may have some "real world" value. However, **the mere fact that the claim may satisfy the utility requirement of 35 US. C. 101 does not mean that a useful result is achieved under the practical application requirement.** The claimed invention as a whole must produce a "useful, concrete and tangible" result to have a practical application.

12. Regarding Claim 1, "A method of providing directed search for a web site address broadcast on television, the method comprising:

creating a database containing one or more web site identifiers input by an advertiser associated with the television broadcast of the web site address;

permitting a user to search the database by inputting at least one of the web site identifiers; and

providing to the user a search response including one or more web site addresses broadcast on television,

wherein the one or more web site identifiers include at least one member of the group consisting of:

a location where the user may have received the television broadcast of the web site address;

a time of day or date or dates when the user may have received the television broadcast of the web site address;

a channel number or call-letters for the station on which the web site address may have been broadcast; and

the name of a television program the user may have been watching when the web site address may have been broadcast", is directed to "abstract idea" because all of the elements in the claim 1 would reasonably be interpreted by one of ordinary skill in light of the disclosure at page 5, line 9-28, page 6-10, as software, such that the method is software, per se, is "non-statutory subject matter" and claim 1 do not have "practical application" because the "final result" by the claimed invention in the claim 1 elements particularly "***the name of a television program the user may have been watching when the web site address may have been broadcast***" is merely routines or steps related to television program channels, but do not produce "useful, and concrete" result, therefore, claim 1 is a non-statutory subject matter.

The claimed invention is subject to the test of State Street, 149 F.3d at 1373-74, 47 USPQ2d at 1601-02. Specifically State Street sets forth that the claimed invention



Art Unit: 2166

must produce a "useful, concrete result" In other words `the claims lack the necessary physical articles or objects to constitute a machine or a manufacture within the meaning of 35 USC 101. They are clearly not a series of steps or acts to be a process nor are they a combination of chemical compounds to be a composition of matter. As such, they fail to fall within a statutory category. They are, at best, functional descriptive material per se.

*The Interim Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications for Patent Subject Matter Eligibility states in section IV C. 2 b. (2) (on page 21 in the PDF format):*

*The tangible requirement does not necessarily mean that a claim must either be tied to a particular machine or apparatus or must operate to change articles or materials to a different state or thing. However, the tangible requirement does require that the claim must recite more than a § 101 judicial exception, in that the process claim must set forth a practical application of that § 101 judicial exception to produce a real-world result. Benson, 409 U.S. at 71-72, 175 USPQ at 676-77 (invention ineligible because had "no substantial practical application.").*

[If] Claims 1 have the result of producing "real-world" results related to **"the name of a television program the user may have been watching when the web site address may have been broadcast"**, however the claim[s] do not specify that the result either output, displayed or at least stored to a user.

The examiner reviewed the specification page 5, line 9-28, page 6-10 but was unable to find a practical real-world use of the result ("**the name of a television**

***program the user may have been watching when the web site address may have been broadcast***"). If the applicant is able to find one and inserts it into the claims provide the location the element is found in the specification.

Claims 2-4 depend from claim 1 is also rejected in the analysis above .

13. Regarding claim 5, "A method for creating a directed search database of web sites broadcast on television, comprising:

providing each of a plurality of information providers access to a secured portion of the database;

providing each information provider one or more identifier categories;

allowing each information provider to store in the secured portion of the database one or more identifiers associated with a web site broadcast on television, each identifier corresponding to an identifier category; and

creating a search query with the one or more identifier categories,

wherein the one or more web site identifiers include at least one member of the group consisting of:

a location where the user may have received the television broadcast of the web site address;

a time of day or date or dates when the user may have received the television broadcast of the web site address;

a channel number or call-letters for the station on which the web site address may have been broadcast; and

the name of a television program the user may have been watching when the web site address may have been broadcast, and

wherein a user searches the database by inputting at least one identifier in the search query, and a search result including a web site associated with the input identifier is provided when the search query is executed", is directed to "abstract idea" because all of the elements in the claim 5 would reasonably be interpreted by one of ordinary skill in light of the disclosure at page 5, line 9-28, page 6-10, as software, such that the method is software, per se, is "non-statutory subject matter" and claim 5 do not have "practical application" because the "final result" by the claimed invention in the claim 1 elements particularly ***"the name of a television program the user may have been watching when the web site address may have been broadcast, and wherein a user searches the database by inputting at least one identifier in the search query, and a search result including a web site associated with the input identifier is provided when the search query is executed"*** is merely routines or steps related to television program channels, inputting the search query and is executing the query but do not produce "useful, and concrete" result, therefore, claim 5 is a non-statutory subject matter.

The claimed invention is subject to the test of State Street, 149 F.3d at 1373-74, 47 USPQ2d at 1601-02. Specifically State Street sets forth that the claimed invention must produce a "useful, concrete result" In other words the claims lack the necessary

Art Unit: 2166

physical articles or objects to constitute a machine or a manufacture within the meaning of 35 USC 101. They are clearly not a series of steps or acts to be a process nor are they a combination of chemical compounds to be a composition of matter. As such, they fail to fall within a statutory category. They are, at best, functional descriptive material per se.

*The Interim Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications for Patent Subject Matter Eligibility states in section IV C. 2 b. (2) (on page 21 in the PDF format):*

*The tangible requirement does not necessarily mean that a claim must either be tied to a particular machine or apparatus or must operate to change articles or materials to a different state or thing. However, the tangible requirement does require that the claim must recite more than a § 101 judicial exception, in that the process claim must set forth a practical application of that § 101 judicial exception to produce a real-world result. Benson, 409 U.S. at 71-72, 175 USPQ at 676-77 (invention ineligible because had "no substantial practical application.").*

[If] Claims 5 have the result of producing "real-world" results related to ***"the name of a television program the user may have been watching when the web site address may have been broadcast, and wherein a user searches the database by inputting at least one identifier in the search query, and a search result including a web site associated with the input identifier is provided when the search query is executed"***, however the claim[s] do not specify that the result either output, displayed or at least stored to a user.

Art Unit: 2166

The examiner reviewed the specification page 5, line 9-28, page 6-10 but was unable to find a practical real-world use of the result ("***the name of a television program the user may have been watching when the web site address may have been broadcast, and wherein a user searches the database by inputting at least one identifier in the search query, and a search result including a web site associated with the input identifier is provided when the search query is executed***"). If the applicant is able to find one and inserts it into the claims provide the location the element is found in the specification.

Claims 6-8 depend from claim 5 is also rejected in the analysis above.

***For "General Analysis for Determining Patent-Eligible Subject Matter", see 101 Interim Guidelines as indicated below:***

***«<http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/pac/dapp/ogsheet.html>»***

***No new matter to be added.***

*Double Patenting*

14. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

*A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).*

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

15. Claims 1,5 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1,6 of co pending Application No. **10/828,640**, is now US Pub.No. **2004/0199503** , and claims 1,5 of co-pending application SI.No # **10/885,387** is now US Pub.No.

**2004/0236750**, claims 1,5 of co-pending application no # **10/885,388** is unow  
US Pub.No. **2004/0236751**, and claims 1,5 of US Patent No. **6823332**

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because co-pending application claims and issued patent claims are simply directed to searching web site addresses and broadcast over television. At least the methods of the current application and issued US Patent No. 6823332 and co-pending applications particularly 10/826640 have the same practical application i.e., search the database for web site associated with the input identifiers.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

16. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

17. ***Claims 1-3,5,7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Wugofski, Theodore et al. [hereafter Wugofski], WO 99/35845, published on 15 July 1999.***

18. As to claim 1, A method of providing directed search for a web site address broadcast on television' [page 5, line 24-26], Wugofski specifically teaches user

Art Unit: 2166

accessing networked television program services particularly websites about specific television channels or programs as detailed in page 5, line 24-26;

'creating a database containing one or more web site identifiers input by an advertiser associated with the television broadcast of the web site address' [page 5, line 28-29, page 6, line 1-4, page 6, line 29, page 7, line 1-3], Wugofski specifically teaches web site identifiers input by the advertiser for example as detailed in page 7, line 2-3;

'permitting a user to search the database by inputting at least one of the web site identifiers' [page 7, line 5-9, line 18-22], Wugofski specifically suggests user searching and selecting required website from the website window as detailed in page 7, line 18-20;

'providing to the user a search response including one or more web site addresses broadcast on television' [page 7, line 10-14], Wugofski specifically suggests search results displays the current program, i.e., displaying the website window and television program as detailed in page 7, line 12-14;

'wherein the one or more web site identifiers include at least one member of the group consisting of' [page 5, line 24-26]

a location where the user may have received the television broadcast of the web site address' [page 5, line 24-29, page 6, line 1-4], Wugofski suggests database maintains specific websties about specific television channels or programs as detailed in page 5, line 25-26;;



'a time of day or date or dates when the user may have received the television broadcast of the web site address' [fig 5, page 7, line 16-17], fig 5 specifically displaying time, date, and day of specific television program from web site;

a channel number or call-letters for the station on which the web site address may have been broadcast' [page 5, line 28-29, page 6, line 1-4, fig 3], Wugofski specifically suggests web site address or URL address, program or channel identifiers, in a data structure as detailed in fig 3;

the name of a television program the user may have been watching when the web site address may have been broadcast' [page 6, line 29, page 7, line 1-3], Wugofski specifically suggests time, program identifier and web site for example NBC, and Scinfeld and like as detailed in page 7 line 1-3.

19. As to claim 2, Wugofski disclosed 'wherein the search response further includes information related to a web site associated with the web site address broadcast on television' [page 4, line 14-16, fig 1, fig 5].

20. As to claim 3, 8, Wugofski disclosed 'wherein the one or more web site identifiers further include at least one member of the group [fig 3]

'a product or products associated with the web site address; a service or services associated with the web site address' [page 8, line 21-22, line 24-25];

'a subject matter of interest associated with the television program or the web site address broadcast on television' [page 8, line 10-12]

'the name of a host, celebrity or personality associated with the television program' [page 7, line 16-17, fig 2].

21. As to claim 5, Wugotski teaches a system which including 'A method for creating a directed search database of web sites broadcast on television' [page 5, line 24-26], Wugofski specifically teaches user accessing networked television program services particularly websites about specific television channels or programs as detailed in page 5, line 24-26];

'providing each of a plurality of information providers access to a secured portion of the database [page 5, line 26-29], Wugotski specifically suggests user defined data records, particularly, each record is identified or includes computer service identifier field as detailed in fig 3, element 113D;

providing each information provider one or more identifier categories' [page 6, line 1-4], information categories corresponds to various fields in the relational field as detailed in fig 3;;

allowing each information provider to store in the secured portion of the database one or more identifiers associated with a web site broadcast on television, each identifier corresponding to an identifier category' [page 6, line 17-19, fig 2-3];

creating a search query with the one or more identifier categories' [page 7, line 4-9], search query corresponds to searching computer-services database as detailed in step 230;

'wherein the one or more web site identifiers include at least one member of the group consisting of: [page 5, line 24-26]

a location where the user may have received the television broadcast of the web site address' [page 5, line 24-29, page 6, line 1-4], Wugofski suggests database maintains specific websties about specific television channels or programs as detailed in page 5, line 25-26;;

'a time of day or date or dates when the user may have received the television broadcast of the web site address' [fig 5, page 7, line 16-17], fig 5 specifically displaying time, date, and day of specific television program from web site;

a channel number or call-letters for the station on which the web site address may have been broadcast' [page 5, line 28-29, page 6, line 1-4, fig 3], Wugofski specifically suggests web site address or URL address, program or channel identifiers, in a data structure as detailed in fig 3;

the name of a television program the user may have been watching when the web site address may have been broadcast' [page 6, line 29, page 7, line 1-3], Wugofski specifically suggests time, program identifier and web site for example NBC, and Scinfeld and like as detailed in page 7 line 1-3

wherein a user searches the database by inputting at least one identifier in the search query [page 5, line 28-29, page 6, line 1-4, page 6, line 29, page 7, line 1-3], Wugofski specifically teaches web site identifiers input by the advertiser for example as detailed in page 7, line 2-3 , and a search result including a web site associated with the input identifier is provided when the search query is executed' [page 7, line 18-20].

22. As to claim 7, Wugofski disclosed 'each information provider to store in the secured portion of the database non-identifier information relating to the web site' [page 7, line 14-17].

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

23. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

24. ***Claims 4, 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wugofski, Theodore et al. [hereafter Wugofski], WO 99/35845, published on 15 July 1999 as applied to claims 1, 5 above, and further in view of Toki, US Patent No. 5895462 published on April 20, 1999.***

Art Unit: 2166

25. As to claim 4, 6, Wugofski does not suggests 'database is password protected'. On the other hand, Toki disclosed [col 11, line 33-45], Toki specifically teaches login name field, password field as detailed in fig 14.

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Toki into associating web sites to the television programs of Wugofski et al. because both Wugofski, Toki are directed to network related web sites and broadcasting television programs, more specifically both Wugofski, Toki teaches users searching on-line web sites for various television broadcasting programs [see Abstract; Toki: Abstract], also, both Wugofski, Toki specifically teaches data structure related to service database records [see Wugofski: fig 3; Toki, fig 14] and both teach PC related TV broadcast programs [see Wugofski: fig 1, page 4, line 14-16; Toki: col 11, line 33-37] and both are from same field of endeavor.

One of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Toki into associating web sites to the television programs of Wugofski et al. because that would have allowed users of Wugofski to incorporate additional fields related to database access, specifically, password field, login name field in the data structure [see Toki: fig 14], so that specific user id controls the access to the database contents and user to select and execute respective information as and when required as suggested by Toki [col 3, line 39-50].

***Conclusion***


***The prior art made of record***

- a. US Patent. No. 5895462
- b. WO 99/35845

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Srirama Channavajjala whose telephone number is 571-272-4108. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM Eastern Time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alam, Hosain, T, can be reached on (571) 272-3978. The fax phone numbers for the organization where the application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free)

SC  
Patent Examiner.  
October 5, 2006.

  
**SRIRAMA CHANNAVAJJALA**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**